DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 902 SO 015 718

AUTHOR Eisenberg, Diane U., Ed.
TITLE Shaping Civic Values in a Technological Age: Public and Private Challenges. Toward a National Dialogue. Conference Report and Discussion Guide on the Jennings Randolph Forum (2nd, Washington, District of Columbia, May 8-10, 1983).
PUB DATE Sep 83
NOTE 24p.; For 1982 conference report, see SO 014 614. Photographs may not reproduce clearly. Conference sponsored by the Benton Foundation, the Occidental International Corp., the R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, and the Close Up Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 520, Washington, DC 20036 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Civics; *Community Programs; Constitutional History; Controversial Issues (Course Content); Democracy; *Democratic Values; Futures (of Society); Government (Administrative Body); Government Role; School Role; Social Problems; Technological Advancement; *Technology; Telecommunications
IDENTIFIERS Business and Society

ABSTRACT

Designed as a resource for community program planners and teachers, this publication reports the highlights of a national conference on civic values in the technological age and provides guidelines for planning community discussions on the topic. Following an introduction, four sections of conference highlights are presented in a uniform format: suggested discussion questions, excerpts of conference papers or debate, community program suggestions, and recommended resources and readings. The first section, the keynote address, concerns the erosion of the concept of public service. Suggested community programs include forums on the impact of the news media and communication technology on citizen participation. The second section outlines conference papers addressing the impact of technology on the constitutional system. Citizenship skills needed for the future, and past and future adaptations of the Constitution are considered. Community programs commemorating the United States Constitution bicentennial are recommended. In the third section, the question of who bears responsibility for shaping civic values is debated. School, government, business, and news media roles in social value formation are explored. Discussion questions focus on educational quality and reform. The fourth section examines the potential impact of communication technologies on the political process and citizenship. After these highlights, a concluding section outlines conference recommendations for a national dialogue. Lists of conference speakers and attendees are appended. (LP)

ED244902

COUNCIL for the ADVANCEMENT of CITIZENSHIP

CAC

*Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum*

# SHAPING CIVIC VALUES IN A TECHNOLOGICAL AGE: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CHALLENGES

*Toward a National Dialogue*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diane U. Eisenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# CONFERENCE REPORT and DISCUSSION GUIDE

SO 015 718

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


**PREFACE: THE JENNINGS RANDOLPH FORUM AND BEYOND** ..... 1

CAC Executive Director *Diane U. Eisenberg* explains the dual purpose of this publication. As conference report *and* discussion guide, it is a resource to engender broad nationwide discussion of the Forum topic.

**INTRODUCTION TO THE FORUM** ..... 3

*R. Freeman Butts*, distinguished educator and Chairman of the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum, writes about the missing element from recent commission reports on education—a forthright proposal to strengthen the civic mission of American education.

**FORUM HIGHLIGHTS**

GOVERNING IN A TECHNOLOGICAL AGE ..... 5

In his keynote address, *Haynes Johnson*, columnist for *The Washington Post*, spoke about the serious erosion of our concept of public service and raised the question of our ability to govern ourselves in a civil, sane, progressive society in the technological age.

CIVIC VALUES: PAST AND PRESENT ..... 7

At a breakfast panel, Professors *Paul L. Murphy* of the University of Minnesota and *Bernard Murchland* of Ohio Wesleyan University presented papers on our constitutional system of government in a technological age.

SHAPING CIVIC VALUES: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY? ..... 10

At a morning panel discussion, *Rachel B. Tompkins* of the Children's Defense Fund, *Michael O. Ware* of Conoco, Inc., North Carolina State Superintendent *A. Craig Phillips*, and National Public Radio Correspondent *Linda Wertheimer* examined the question of who is responsible for shaping civic values.

THE NEW COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION ..... 12

Representative *Albert Gore, Jr.*, (D-Tennessee) spoke directly to the potential impact of communications technologies on the political process and citizenship in a Monday afternoon luncheon address. The Forum returned to that subject on Tuesday morning during a special C-SPAN telecast with panelists *Delano E. Lewis* of C&P Telephone Company, Charles F. Kettering Foundation President *David Mathews*, and Representative *Thomas J. Tauke* (R-Iowa), moderated by C-SPAN President *Brian Lamb*.

**FORUM RECOMMENDATIONS: TOWARD A NATIONAL DIALOGUE** ..... 16

On the final morning of the Forum, participants heard reports from five group roundtable discussions held the previous afternoon. As their major recommendation, participants called for a dialogue at the local level throughout the nation on the topic of shaping civic values in a technological age.

**FORUM SPEAKERS** ..... 18

**FORUM CONFEREES** ..... 19

**CAC MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS** ..... 21

# PREFACE

# THE JENNINGS RANDOLPH FORUM AND BEYOND

This publication has been designed to serve two purposes:

- *IT IS A CONFERENCE REPORT* on the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum, convened by the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship on May 9-10, 1983, at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City in Arlington, Virginia.

- *IT IS A DISCUSSION GUIDE* for community program planners and teachers to help them take the dialogue begun at the Jennings Randolph Forum beyond the nation's capitol to their schools and communities across the country.

Over one hundred representatives from education, government, the independent sector, and the media came together for three days this spring to participate in CAC's Jennings Randolph Forum, where conferees addressed the technological revolution and its ramifications for the basic values, ideas and practices of citizenship.

As their major recommendation, *Forum participants called for the establishment of a nationwide dialogue at the community level on the topic of shaping civic values in a technological age.* They urged the Council to assume a leadership role in initiating the dialogue. Accordingly, this conference report and discussion guide is presented as the first step. It is intended as a resource for you and other program planners in your community. Additional copies are available from CAC. With this publication and through our member national organizations, we offer to assist you in carrying the debate on technology and citizenship to your communities.

To assist you in planning community discussion programs, each section of the publication contains the following four parts:

- **Suggested Discussion Questions.** Use these questions to help define topics and issues for your community and school programs.
- **Forum Highlights.** Pertinent excerpts from the Forum speeches and panels to serve as background materials for both your planning committee and program participants.
- **Program Suggestions and Resources.** Several suggested formats for your community and school programs along with ideas for finding speakers and panelists.
- **Related Readings.** Suggested readings for participants who want to explore further the issues discussed at your programs.

A community discussion program on this topic can be offered by any institution:

- civic group, religious organization, or social club.
- high school, community college or university.
- library, museum or historical society.

A community discussion program can take many forms: roundtable, panel, lecture, townhall meeting, slide presentation, or debate. It can be held anywhere: in a classroom, in a hall, in a museum or library, at a senior center, on a lawn, in someone's living room or in the studio of your local cable television access group. The suggested topics are broad enough

and important enough to command the interest and attention of all citizens.

As you use these suggestions, adapt them to new developments gleaned from current newspapers and periodicals. Your best sources of ideas are, of course, the members of your group, your students, and people in your community. If your school or community group needs more help with arranging discussion programs on this important topic, CAC and its member organizations stand ready to provide format suggestions, possible speakers and background materials.

The Council for the Advancement of Citizenship is committed to the belief that the vitality of our Constitutional system depends on an active and informed citizenry. We believe that a dialogue on the implications of the new communications technologies for our constitutional form of government is particularly significant now, as we approach the U.S. Constitution Bicentennial in 1987. We hope that community groups and schools across the country will join with us by conducting community wide discussion programs on technology and citizenship as their special projects for the upcoming bicentennial.

Many dedicated persons gave generously of their time to the design and conduct of the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum. Special recognition for their exceptional commitment to both the purposes and actuality of the Forum must be accorded to Stephen A. Janger, Immediate Past President of the Council, and R. Freeman Butts, Chairman of the Forum Committee. As well, members of the Forum Committee Allan S. Cohen, Harry J. Hogan, Lynne B. Iglitzin and Mary Ann Kirk worked conscientiously to select this year's Forum topic and to define it in terms of its implications for citizenship and citizenship education. Barbara Finkelstein assumed the critical task of structuring the Forum's roundtable discussions. Bruce Adams, who served admirably as conference recorder, brought his creative talents and penchant for clarity to the preparation of this publication. Others to whom I owe my personal appreciation are Charles Tampio, Laura Maxwell, Bernard Murchland, Rob Lehman, Paul Murphy, Margery Kraus, Alice O'Connor, Brian Lamb, Carolyn Sachs, Charles McBride, Philip McGance, Rusty Andres and Kristin Floyd.

The Council is especially appreciative of the role that Senator Jennings Randolph assumed at this year's Forum. Once again, his words and presence set the requisite tone for our deliberations.

An impressive roster of speakers and conferees participated in the Forum. The Council is appreciative of their contributions and encouraged by their commitment to the study of a pressing topic on the national agenda as it relates to civic life.

As this publication reaches you, the planning process for next year's Forum will have begun. With leadership again from R. Freeman Butts, and newly elected CAC president, John H. Buchanan, Jr., the Third Annual Jennings Randolph Forum will again address a critical national issue in terms of its ramifications for citizenship. We welcome your suggestions for the upcoming Forum. We also welcome your reactions to this publication as a learning resource for group discussion programs. And finally, we extend an invitation to your organization to become a member of the Council and by so doing, join with other colleagues who are committed to the advancement of an informed and responsible citizenry.

Diane U. Eisenberg

**Diane U. Eisenberg**
**Executive Director**
**Council for the Advancement of Citizenship**
**September, 1983**

# INTRODUCTION TO THE FORUM

A not very funny thing happened on our way to the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum in May, 1983. We were almost swept away by a rising tide of national commission reports on what ails American education and what should be done to reform it. We were almost engulfed by a wave of calls for the "new priority" of technological, scientific, or computer literacy. These voices echoed former Governor Jerry Brown's earlier campaign to augment the basic Three R's in schooling with the Three C's:

- Computing,
- Calculating,
- Communications through technology.

Happily, this public attention to technology in education gave zest to one part of our already planned and announced theme for the Forum. But, unhappily, the media and some of the reports were neglecting the other part of our theme: shaping civic values for the advancement of citizenship. So, if I may borrow the title of a recent paper by Louis C. Gawthrop of Indiana University, I proposed another set of meanings for the basic Three C's, which are particularly appropriate to apply to the man who is honored by the Jennings Randolph Forum:

- *Civis* - citizen;
- *Civitas* - the body of citizens united in a political community;
- *Civilitas* - the art of government and politics; or the demeanor of distinguished citizens.

If the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship had the authority to award degrees I would propose that Senator Randolph be designated Doctor of Civis, Civitas, and Civilitas, Honoris Causa:

- Civis - Citizen Extraordinaire;
- Civitas - vigorous advocate for half a century of a strengthened and democratic body politic;
- Civilitas - exemplar of the arts of government and politics as well as the decency and demeanor characterizing the best of traditional civility.

So the task of our Forum was to sort out the value of the 3 C's of citizenship when confronted by the 3 C's of technology. Are they compatible? Are they symbiotic? Will they undermine or even destroy one another? Shall we be optimistic or pessimistic? These are the questions that we addressed at the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum. We hoped to fill the gap in the public debate over the predicament and prescriptions for reform of American schools. Five national task forces reported to the American people in the weeks just before and after the Forum, and they received considerable attention, as they should. I am delighted that the importance of education is being put where it belongs—up front on the public agenda of the nation.

But there was something missing—something enormously important as we once again seek educational reform. Missing was the forthright and pervasive recognition of the primary purpose of free, universal, compulsory and common schooling. Missing was sufficient emphasis upon the *civic* mission of American public education. Its prime purpose is to prepare informed, rational, humane and participating citizens in a democratic republic.

Instead, the public discussion thus far made it seem that the most important reform was to require more courses, especially in science, mathematics and computer technology. Computer literacy somehow seemed more important than civic literacy. This was not entirely the fault of the reports themselves. Much has been made by the press and the TV commentators of selected parts of the reports. And the recent parading of electronic enticements for schools had tended to color the discussions. Two days before the report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Education was issued, the Spring Survey of *The New York Times* (April 24) proclaimed a "New Priority: Technological Literacy." Most of the 80-page issue was devoted to articles and ads about schooling and "high tech." On the last two pages there were short plaintive articles on "Leave Some Room for the

Liberal Arts" and "Feeling Low about High Technology."

It was not surprising that the National Task Force on Education for Economic Growth or the Business Higher Education Forum should stress science, mathematics and computer literacy in their effort to promote greater productivity in jobs, markets and the economy. But the publicity given to the President's Commission on Excellence in Education also tended to stress the *economic* risk to the nation: "Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world."

This, of course, was attention-getting and newsworthy, especially in the current state of the economy and politics. But it tended to overshadow what came along in a little-noticed later section of the report:

> *Our concern, however, goes well beyond matters such as industry and commerce. It also includes the intellectual, moral, and spiritual strengths of our people which knit together the very fabric of our society. . . . A high level of shared education is essential to a free, democratic society and to the fostering of a common culture, especially in a country that prides itself on pluralism and individual freedom.*

Other references to the civic function of public education were overlooked when President Reagan upstaged the report by reemphasizing his own proposals for the reform of education: tax credits, vouchers, prayer, and the abolition of the Department of Education, issues with which the Commission report did not deal. The President returned to these themes in his commencement address at Seton Hall University on May 21, and in subsequent conferences.

Something similar happened to the Twentieth Century Fund's Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. The front page story of *The New York Times* played up a recommendation that federal bilingual-education funds should be shifted to English-teaching for non English speaking children. Too little attention has been given to the forthright recommendation of a core program for *all* students which includes a "knowledge of civics," or what Aristotle called "the education for the citizenry in the spirit of the polity."

And, I am sure that advocates of private schools, tuition tax credits, or vouchers wished to overlook the Task Force's explicit repudiation of such proposals and its clear affirmation that "the public schools . . . constitute the nation's most important institution for the shaping of future citizens" and "the provision of free public education must continue to be a public responsibility of high priority, while support of nonpublic education should remain a private obligation."

Finally, the College Board's recommendations for the six academic subjects and the six intellectual skills necessary for college-bound high school students commendably stress a balance between the humanities and the sciences, but the civic learning required of prospective college students to prepare them for citizenship seemed muted at best.

Now that education has the public's attention once again it is sure to be a major political issue in the 1984 campaign. Dare I suggest that we need yet one more blue-ribbon commission, made up of scholars, educators, and public leaders steeped in the humanities, law and the social and political sciences, to undertake: (1) a serious and sustained reexamination of the historic ideas and values of American citizenship and the technological challenges it faces; and (2) a reassessment of the role that education should play in shaping the civic values, knowledge and skills of American citizens in the coming decades?

We now have before us structural proposals for educational reform dealing with academic excellence and quality, higher standards and requirements, increased financing, and the like. All to the good. But we still need to deal with the substantive ideas, content and spirit of educational programs that will lead to the civic discipline and commitments essential for achieving the common purposes of our constitutional order.

Just before World War I, William James called for "a moral equivalent" to war: "The only thing needed hence forward is to inflame the civic temper as past history has inflamed the military temper."

As we look past Orwell's *1984* toward the bicentennial years of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, this is what is missing in our current debates over educational reform. To inform as well as to inflame the civic temper is the goal of the Jennings Randolph Forum.

***R. Freeman Butts and Senator Jennings Randolph***

R. Freeman Butts

**R. Freeman Butts, Chair**
**Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum**
**September, 1983**

*Sunday, May 8, 1983*

# GOVERNING IN A TECHNOLOGICAL AGE

The Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum began with a reception and dinner in honor of Senator Randolph. Stephen A. Janger, President of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, introduced Senator Randolph as an individual who has devoted his extraordinary public life to the affirmation of citizenship values in our country. As the author of the Twenty-sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Senator Randolph expressed concern about the low level of voting participation by young people. Randolph reminded the audience that "democracy is not a spectator sport" and that "freedom requires an ever vigilant citizenry."

Haynes Johnson, a Pulitzer Prize winning columnist for *The Washington Post*, gave the keynote address. Johnson spoke about the serious erosion of our conception of public service and raised the question of our ability to govern ourselves in a civil, sane, progressive society in the technological age. Johnson declined to propose specific solutions to the problems he cited, arguing that "the only solution you can offer is to raise questions. You must frame the debate and say it is not acceptable behavior just to go down the road of technological progress with our lack of knowledge and perspective."

## Suggested Discussion Questions

- Do the new communications technologies threaten this country's traditional democratic process of open and robust debate, active public involvement, and thoughtful deliberation?
- To what degree have the news media contributed to the public skepticism about our leaders and institutions?
- Why is it that the more we know as citizens, the less we seem to believe?
- Why is it that the better educated we are, the less we vote?
- Has citizen interest in government and community activities decreased?
- What responsibility do individual citizens have to contribute to the reconstitution of a healthy community?

## Excerpts from the Keynote Address by Haynes Johnson

I came here tonight for two reasons. I was flattered to be asked to speak to you and I was proud because of Jennings Randolph. This Forum marries the ideas of someone who represents what I consider to be the essence of public service with the idea that we are in an age in which that concept is very seriously being eroded and is under assault.

I will argue with you that our ability to govern ourselves in a civil, sane, progressive society is very much in jeopardy right now in the 1980's. It is not because of any one fact. It is because of so many. But I will throw out a few paradoxes: Why is it that the more we know as citizens, the less we seem to believe? Why is it that the better educated we are the less we vote?

We have now had an entire generation in which everyone who offered himself for national leadership in a major way has been destroyed. And it has happened all before our own eyes. Even if you wanted to escape it, it happened in your living room. Whether it was the murder of a president, the disgrace of a president, the rejection of a president, or the wounding of a presidential candidate. An entire generation of leadership has come and gone. I do not think we can look at the questions of civic values, citizenship, ethics, and the political health of our society without putting those factors into the discussion.

All of this has occurred at a time when the technological age has brought it all home so rapidly and so personally. Television in the last twenty years, and all the other segments of our life, have made us so aware of these factors. Citizens have come to feel that while they know so much more about so many things, they do not really sense that there is much that can be done about them.

I think that American citizens today desperately want a sense of harmony in the country. They want reassurance. They want solidarity. They want continuity. We have seen so much turmoil, so much bewildering change that what worries me most is that they will opt for something that offers something simple. The easy way. And not take the hard way of individual thought and debate which is the only way in a democratic society that we really make progress. That troubles me a lot because I see many indications that people are weary and willing to let the other guy do it. Now I do not mean to suggest that we are in some great terrible trough of despondency in this country or that we have lost the capacity to hope or to believe. I don't believe that to be true. What we have lost is the concept of public service—the key central core of authority that makes the system actually function.

We have so painted a picture of disgrace, of ignominy, of ignobility that the people seem willing to believe the worst. And it is very easy to blame many aspects of the society. You can criticize my business—the press. That is part of it. It is also true that recently it is much easier for our public leaders to run against the person in power or the opponent. Negative campaigning, vicious campaigning in a kind of way that poisons the faith and believability of the people who are to serve. I also think it goes worse than that. I remember covering the war in Vietnam and coming back in the year of 1969 and going to communities to see what the experiences of some of the young veterans were when they came back. And I will never forget a group of young Marines who had come home to a suburb outside of Boston to find themselves branded as criminals, murderers, awful sorts of people. They would not wear their uniforms in public. Something of that same attitude permeates those who now serve the public in private uniform. There is a sense of shame attached to the idea that serving the country, celebrating its debating process and techniques, is an honorable profession. I think that is a great tragedy. And I think we are all to blame for it . . .

We are not at the age of George Orwell. This country remains far stronger than its critics suggest. We have proven over the last generation of all of the strains, at home and abroad, all the disasters, to be remarkably resilient. We have bounced back from one national calamity after another. But what we have not been able to do is reinculcate the idea that one of the finest things you can do is to understand the system that you have and

try to perfect it—make it better—and that should be its own reward.

So I was pleased to come here, not to tell you my solutions. No one has any solutions. The only solution you can offer is to raise questions. You must frame the debate and say it is not acceptable behavior just to go down the road of technological progress with our lack of knowledge and perspective.

## Program Suggestions and Resources

The remarks of Senator Randolph and the keynote address by journalist Haynes Johnson raised important questions about the health of our democratic system of government. The discussion questions suggested above can help you frame community discussion programs and classroom dialogues about the causes and significance of the erosion of public service that worries both speakers.

One community discussion program could focus on the responsibility of individual citizens to contribute to the reconstitution of a strong and healthy political system. Every community has dozens of public citizens who take on leadership roles in community organizations such as the League of Women Voters, the United Way, and the Cancer Society. These people as well as local elected officials would make ideal panelists as they could explain their commitment to the community and the personal satisfaction that they have had from their work. Political scientists and historians capable of placing today's mood in the perspective of our two hundred year experiment with democracy would also make a valuable contribution. It might be especially enlightening to mix the generations by asking local members of the American Association of Retired Persons, for example, to share with students their sense of the historical struggle for equal voting rights, especially for women and minorities, in this country.

Another discussion program might focus on the impact of the news media and communications technologies on the political process and citizen participation. Critics argue that the news media undercut public confidence in our institutions by emphasizing personality over policy, conflict over consensus, strategy over substance, and error over achievement. With television, bad news is brought into our living rooms on an instant basis at all hours of the day or night, exaggerating negative attitudes. But journalism, at its best, is an essential guardian of our democratic principles. Members of the press could join with media critics and others to discuss the effect of journalistic coverage on public confidence in our major institutions. They could also discuss the opportunities and possible dangers presented by the new communications technologies. This might be a particularly appropriate topic to be broadcast on your local cable television access channel.

*CAC Immediate Past President Stephen Janger and Haynes Johnson*

*Senator Jennings Randolph, CAC board member Rebecca Patts Butler, and Ellis Williams*

## Related Readings

- *The Confidence Gap* by Seymour Martin Lipset and William Schneider. The authors map the trends of public confidence in government, business, and labor for the last fifty years by examining a broad range of polling data. (The Free Press, 1983).
- *American Journey* by Richard Reeves. The author retraces the journey of Alexis de Tocqueville to find the similarities and differences between the Americans of the 1830s and their 1980s counterparts. (Simon and Schuster, 1982).
- *New Rules* by Daniel Yankelovich. One of America's leading analysts shows the turbulent effect of sharply changed social, economic, and political circumstances in what he calls a "world turned upside down." (Random House, 1981).
- *Public Opinion* by Walter Lippman. This book examines what public opinion is, how it is formed, and how it can be made effective in contributing to the solution of local and international problems. (1922).
- *America in Search of Itself*, by Theodore White. This is a journalist's view of the self-evaluation America has undergone during the past two decades and the changes in image and civic values and behavior which can be traced using the dominant events and political figures of our time. (Harper and Row, 1982).
- *The Republic of Technology*, by Daniel Boorstin. The series of brief essays collected here examines the meaning of technology for Americans in the past, present, and possibly in the future. (Harper and Row, 1978).
- *Understanding Media*, by Marshall McLuhan. This classic of media studies explains the "medium is the message" idea and discusses various media and communications technologies, how people have used them, how they have affected societies, and their role in creating mass culture. (McGraw Hill, 1964).

*Monday, May 9, 1983*

# CIVIC VALUES: PAST AND PRESENT

The Forum opened on Monday morning with a breakfast panel on "Civic Values: Past and Present." R. Freeman Butts, Chairman of the Jennings Randolph Forum presided. Paul L. Murphy, Professor of History and American Studies at the University of Minnesota, and Bernard Murchland, Professor of Philosophy at Ohio Wesleyan University, presented papers and answered questions from Forum conferees.

Professor Murphy spoke of the eternal principles of modern constitutionalism and the importance of civic virtue which he defined as "the willingness of people to subordinate their own private self interests to the public interest to the extent that they themselves are part of that public process." Professor Murchland suggested that "there is a serious crisis in public philosophy that has been precipitated by the emergence of the technological society and can be overcome only by rethinking public philosophy and the conditions of citizenship in light of what technology has wrought."

## Suggested Discussion Questions

- How have new technologies changed society in the past?
- How will society today respond to the major changes that are occurring in communications technology?
- Will we control the new communications technologies or will they control us?
- What will people need to know to be effective citizens in a technological society? What skills will they need to have?
- How has our Constitution adapted to changes in society throughout our history?
- If we were to rewrite the Constitution for a technological age, what would it look like? Would it mean a larger or smaller role for government?

## Excerpts from the Breakfast Panel on "Civic Values: Past and Present"

**MURPHY:** When I was in the second grade of the Washington School in Caldwell, Idaho, my teacher, Miss Bates, had on the wall of our classroom a large poster that she made herself and frequently referred to. It is still indelibly engraved on my mind. It was headed in large letters: "RULES FOR BEING A GOOD CITIZEN." And those rules were as follows: Don't spend money foolishly. Speak out for your country. Vote. Be wise; don't do stupid things. Speak out for yourself. Be friendly to your neighbors. Help people in need. Do good deeds. Stand up for your rights. Make people feel wanted and happy. Care for people. Play fair with people. And obey the law.

One clearly has obligations to one's fellow men and women and the community more broadly. And in some ways, although I do not think Miss Bates realized this, she was talking about some of the eternal principles of constitutionalism—which I define as limited government and the rule of law. That is, that governments exist to serve only specified ends and function only according to specified rules. And I see that particular thrust going back to the Greeks through medieval times to the present. It is a central concern which we continue to work for and I think genuinely embrace in this country. . . .

If we talk about modern constitutionalism we are talking about a redefinition of this term, a society that is essentially secular. We are talking about a society whose role was to define political institutions but also to establish them basically as limiting structures as far as people's own basic freedom and rights are concerned. We have a government, as Mr. Lincoln said, "of the people, by the people, and for the people." That is the underlying assumption of the modern constitutional system.

All of this infers that good citizens must be prepared to devote some time to this political process. It means civic virtue which I think generally can be defined as the willingness of people to subordinate their own private self interest to the public interest to the extent that they themselves are part of that public process. And the question again is, and this is why I always start with Miss Bates, how do you begin making young people aware of their obligations, duties, and responsibilities? And I think in some ways you start with devoted teachers in the second grade who take time to make posters and explain the posters to students but you also find that other societal institutions come along which reinforce that process. . . .

But which institutions within our society ultimately are the ones that must play this general role? Is it the public schools' responsibility to infuse people with these values? Is it the parent in the home? Is it the Boy Scout troop? Is it religious bodies? Is it civic organizations? Is it single issue political groups that campaign for or against gun control in our society? And if these bodies are to get young people involved in some level of public responsibilities, how do they make them see payoffs? I have often thought that we would be over a big hurdle if we could convince young people that government is "us" and not "them", that it is "we" and simply not "they", if we could instill some sense of identification with the process. Yet my students in Minnesota often say: "I don't want to vote. There's no point in voting. All of those candidates are simply media produced and media sold. You're not voting for a person, you're voting for someone who has been packaged by a clever PR firm. That person would never listen to me. What's the point of my becoming involved?" The media have placed an additional barrier between the individual at the election booth and the representative.

My final question very simply is one which I hope will elicit some discussion. Constitutionalism is still with us. We saw it, I think, most recently function at the

*Paul Murphy*

time of Watergate. But what does technology do to constitutionalism? Technology by and large can have both a positive and negative effect along the line. The rule of law—doing things by constitutional steps and stages—is as we all know only too well a slow process. It is a deliberative process. It is an argumentative give and take kind of process. We sometimes think it goes on interminably. One wonders what would have happened at Watergate if Congress had actually gone all the way through the impeachment process. I think we would still be doing it at the present time. Can constitutional government with its very deliberate, very obviously slow and sometimes painfully technical stages actually continue to serve us in a very modern fast moving, fast changing kind of political system? If we are going to celebrate the bicentennial in 1987, are we going to celebrate a viable, living, dynamic, ongoing adaptive Constitution or is this going to be a turning point? Are we going to bury one and start a new one in order to conform with the various kinds of challenges of our day?

**MURCHLAND:** I teach a course called Technology and Society and the question that haunts me in that course is the degree to which technology has transformed habits, our day-to-day interrelations. Paul Murphy mentioned the students who ask: "Why vote?" The media packaging of candidates is an instance of how the media technology has transformed our voting habits. Yesterday my home town paper in Ohio carried a story of this year's high school valedictorian who said he wants to be a surgeon because it is the highest level of our technology. Well, we might dispute the fact that it is the highest level, but here is a kid who is thinking technologically. We are citizens of a technological society.

My thesis is that there is a serious crisis in public philosophy that has been precipitated by the emergence of the technological society and can be overcome only by rethinking public philosophy and the conditions of citizenship in light of what technology has wrought.

In my paper, I talk about four models of citizenship. In our culture we look back to the Greek model, to the citizen of the polis. There is also in our tradition the theocratic model of the Christian middle ages, succeeded by the liberal model which is the model that we are most familiar with and whose virtues and vices we most reflect. The liberal model now is giving way to what I call the technological model.

Ideas in the past that were valid in the past models of citizenship still do retain some validity. But they are always reflected and refracted and filtered through the currently vital idea, or in this case the currently vital model of citizenship. I think it is helpful to talk about technological citizenship. Because I think that gives us a perspective on our values, on our attitudes, and indeed on our problems, that the old liberal perspective will not give us. . . .

What are the ends we care about? Father McInnes raised the point just a few minutes ago when he asked how our traditional disciplines—history, philosophy, and the humanities—fit into an educational program in a technological age. The educational program is by definition going to be a technological program. All curriculums are technological in nature today. A professor of Mathematics at MIT was quoted recently as saying that by the end of the century, technology will have completely transformed the classroom as we know it. And I think he is right about that. It probably will equally transform citizenship as we know it and as we have known it. But it is difficult to answer the question of how we impose humanistic goals on technological means.

I think it is true that technology in the final analysis is not just a means, that it sets its own ends. It sets its own goals and it has its own values. Technology must be considered one of the liberal arts. Ted Fisk, Education Editor of *The New York Times* made that point in a recent interview. He told me that we can now say that technology and technological studies are enjoying an equal status beside the traditional division of the social sciences, the sciences and the humanities. But the fact is that there is one division, not four divisions, and that is technology. Students want to learn how to operate machines including the machinery of society. Perfectly legitimate aspirations for citizens of a technological society.

I think we all are aware that our political processes lag behind social process, technological processes, in very important ways. What I am trying to do with my classes now is two things. First, to

draw a profile of the technological citizen. We have bits and snatches but we really do not have a profile of the technological citizen as we have profiles of these other models of citizenship. And the second thing I would like to do is to draw, and I think this would be an easier task, a list of ten technological values. Efficiency undoubtedly would be one of those. And we would analyze them and compare them to previous models. Because I think we all inhabit the technological society at two levels. We are all conscious of living in a technological society because we all use machines, tape recorders, turn on electric switches, and so on and so forth. Some of us live in a technological society in a semiconscious way, and the ideal and the task and challenge that confront us now is how we can live lucidly, fully consciously in a technological society. I think that is one of the questions that a group such as this might profitably explore.

*Forum session*

## Program Suggestions and Resources

Both panelists suggested that it would be desirable to begin now to ask questions about the relationship between technology and our constitutional form of government. Local programs focusing on this topic could be promoted as the opening events of your community's celebration of the U.S. Constitution Bicentenial in 1987.

Political scientists, historians, and constitutional scholars could be invited to share their perspectives on the effect of change on society and government in the past. Futurists, experts on the new technologies, and local citizens active in the public life of your community could be asked to speculate about what the future might hold. By tying a discussion program on this topic to the 1987 Bicentennial, you can recruit other organizations as co-sponsors, and thereby attract substantial community participation.

Discussion programs on the appropriate role of the schools in civic education would be especially relevant at this time. As R. Freeman Butts points out in the introduction of this conference report and discussion guide, education moved to the top of the national public policy agenda as a result of reports issued by a number of prestigious commissions and organizations in 1983. Much has been made of the need to improve our capability to educate for the technological society. But Butts and others think not enough has been said about the need to educate for citizenship. Educators, public officials, and civic leaders could be asked to address these critical questions. With public attention focused on the education issue, this topic should draw wide community interest.

## Related Readings

- "The Obligations of American Citizenship: An Historical Perspective" by Paul L. Murphy and "Citizenship in a Technological Society: Problems and Possibilities" by Bernard Murchland. These two discussion papers were prepared for the Jennings Randolph Forum and are available from the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship.
- *The Civic Purposes of Liberal Learning.* This special Winter 1982 issue of *Liberal Education* was co-sponsored by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and the Association of American Colleges and contains 14 essays on the relationship between the liberal arts and civic arts.
- *The Civic Purposes of Teacher Education.* A special issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* (Jan-Feb, 1984) co-sponsored by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, in cooperation with five professional education associations and the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship.
- *A History of Education in American Culture*, by R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin. This history and assessment of American education was written in the 1950's but is still timely today. The authors look at educational institutions, philosophy, and movements in history and how they related to the larger society and in turn how culture, religion and historical circumstances affected the distinctively American educational system. (Holt, Reinhardt, and Winston, 1953).
- *Democracy and Education*, by John Dewey. This is Dewey's philosophical primer describing the fundamentals of his theory of the role of education in a democracy and the democratic implications of developmental education. (MacMillan, 1916).

*Monday, May 9, 1983*

# SHAPING CIVIC VALUES: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

Forum participants turned next to the fundamental question of who is responsible for shaping civic values in a Monday morning panel discussion with Jeremiah Floyd, Secretary of CAC and Associate Executive Director of the National School Boards Association, presiding. National Public Radio Correspondent Linda Wertheimer moderated a panel that included A. Craig Phillips, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of North Carolina; Rachel B. Tompkins, Executive Director of the Children's Defense Fund; and Michael O. Ware, Director of Legislative Affairs, Conoco, Inc.

*A. Craig Phillips*

*Linda Wertheimer*

*Rachel Tompkins*

*Michael Ware*

## Suggested Discussion Questions

- Will new communications technologies change the ability of key elements of our society to perform their responsibilities for citizenship education?
- Does the government—through the public schools—have the prime responsibility for shaping civic values?
- What is the proper role for the public schools in educating for citizenship?
- Will changing family structures affect our ability to pass on civic values from one generation to the next?
- To what degree should business assume responsibility for broad social concerns?
- What responsibility does the news media have for helping to produce an informed citizenry?

## Excerpts from Panel Discussion on "Shaping Civic Values: Whose Responsibility?"

**TOMPKINS:** Obviously, the family has responsibility for passing along civic values. I think the question for me this morning is the capacity of the family to pass on civic values.

The fact is that fewer than one in 21 families conforms to our mythology of daddy going to work, mommy staying home with the kids, two children. More than one in five children today are in single parent families—13.7 million children. More than half of the children in this country are in families where all parents in the home work. The hours of direct parental supervision for the children's activities are down, and I suggest that this has something to do with how we think about passing on civic values in the family. Rather than lamenting the state of our families, or being nostalgic for some pattern of family living that existed in the past, we ought to think about how to organize our institutions—private/public schools and private organizations—in a way that will ensure that children have adult supervision for those hours when parents are not available. . . .

And I would suggest to you that poverty is something we ought to be concerned about. About one family in eight and one child in five are poor. Poverty does after awhile wear you down. The daily struggles to make ends meet, the sense that nothing gets better, the sense that you cannot have control over your lives, are things that we have to consider when we think about the passing on of civic values. . . . The value of participation is a civic value that I think is terribly important for families to pass on to their children. And the only reason you participate, folks, is because you think it makes a difference. And if you do not think your participation matters, that is a problem.

**WARE:** The question I asked myself was, "does the business sector have a responsibility for citizenship education?" If you talk to our comptrollers, quite candidly the answer is "no." The results are not quantifiable. There is no DCF (Discounted

Cash Flow) on citizenship education. So I asked myself: "How does one go about talking to the comptroller of a corporation who looks only at the DCF, at the results of an investment, and convince him that citizenship education is part of our responsibility? How do we convince him that, although the results are not quantifiable in terms of the bottom line of our business, they are quantifiable in terms of the survival of our business? Why do we have a responsibility, and secondly, how do we carry out that responsibility as corporate citizens?"

Most important, at least to me, in terms of citizenship education, is that the survival of the business sector and the free market and private initiative as we know it is vitally dependent upon the understanding that the citizenry has about government, about the way government operates and about the responsibilities of government. Government creates the arena in which we can participate as businessmen, in which we can develop those bottom lines that our comptrollers are so fond of. Perhaps we will not have a bottom line in the future if we do not get involved more actively in citizenship education.

**PHILLIPS:** The title of this panel is "Shaping Civic Values: Who's Responsibility?" I may surprise you by a quick head-on answer that is a little bit arrogant. I represent this thing called American Public Education. It is a magnificent system that has developed over a long period of time with all of the criticism. We are having impact on the lives of all of our young people or most of our young people. I am a government employee. I work for the public schools. I am a part of public service which has a massive commitment to education in this country. It is obvious that the responsibility for shaping civic values is shared by many elements of society including religious organizations and civic groups. But my major point to you this morning is that the prime responsibility for shaping civic values is in the hands of government. Whether it is dealt with at the national level, the state level, or at the local level, education is government. Because it is paid for by the taxes of citizens and businesses. It is carried out as a function of government. . . . I simply would say to you that the evidence is clear to me that the prime responsibility is in the hands of a system that needs to be nurtured nationally, at the state level, and at the local level if it is going to respond to that mandate for being responsible.

**WEITHEIMER:** In the '50s there were a lot of television programs which were directed at children and families which promoted values of citizenship and families and doing good for other people and being kind and caring for other folks that needed help. Programs of 30 minutes—little parables—which were delivered to us on television. That does not happen anymore. At least not to the same extent. It is an interesting change that our broadcast media has gone through that somehow the notion of teaching appropriate values has just disappeared. And the older the programs, if you watch re-runs, the more of that you see. So the media has changed in lots of ways. I think probably the most important one is the shrinking access Americans have to information that is indepth, serious, and important and not just pre-digested bulletin information. And secondly, there is the change that our entertainment no longer teaches us in ways that it once did.

## Program Suggestions and Resources

Each of the panelists agreed that his or her sector has responsibility for civic education. The family, business, government, and the media all have important roles to play. But a recent report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education warns that American education has deteriorated drastically in the past two decades.

Community discussions are an essential aspect of the national debate over educational priorities now underway. In your community, you could organize an all day conference on responsibilities for educational reform as the first step in a long range community program to improve the public schools. Representatives of business, labor, charitable organizations, and the public schools could be invited to discuss their views of the appropriate goals of public education in your community. The purpose of the conference and subsequent meetings should be to identify specific ways in which the civic and organizational leaders could collaborate in an effort to advance citizenship education and improve the educational system. Invite the public school system and the major organizational interests in your community to cosponsor the conference.

## Related Readings

- *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* The 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (Government Printing Office).
- *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto.* An action proposal for reform of public schooling at the community level written by Mortimer J. Adler on behalf of a distinguished group of educators (MacMillan, 1982).
- *Higher Learning in the Nation's Service.* An essay by Ernest L. Boyer and Fred M. Hechinger that calls on colleges and universities to discover the means and make the effort to serve the nation's interests in new and vital ways (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981).
- *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America.* A case study approach to the context and conditions of a number of high schools with recommendations for curriculum and teaching. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983).
- *Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy.* (Twentieth Century Foundation, 1983).

*Monday, May 9, 1983*
*Tuesday, May 10, 1983*

# THE NEW COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

The Forum focused directly on the critical question of the potential impact of new communications technologies on citizenship during a Monday afternoon luncheon address by Representative Albert Gore, Jr. (D-Tenn.) and a Tuesday morning discussion with panelists Delano E. Lewis, Vice President, C&P Telephone Company; David Mathews, President, Charles F. Kettering Foundation; and Representative Thomas J. Tauke (R-Iowa). The panel discussion was televised live to C-SPAN's national network and moderated by C-SPAN President Brian Lamb.

Representative Gore set the stage for the Forum's discussion of the impact of communications technology on the public policy process by describing a vision of teledemocracy where millions of Americans sitting home and watching television are given the chance to decide the fate of the country by voting on their two way interactive cable systems. Gore said the vision "sounds like a dream to some and a nightmare to others." He said that the communications technologies held the potential of either helping to overcome the special interest grip on the policy process by involving millions of informed citizens or of giving the special interests the tools to fragment and dominate the process.

Participants in the C-SPAN broadcast the next morning agreed with Gore's point that the new communications technologies hold the potential for improving but also for doing harm to the political process. Representative Tauke emphasized cable television's potential ability to improve communications between constituents and their representatives. Delano Lewis said we must not allow technology to control us but must make it work for us. David Mathews suggested the need for new human inventions that would allow us to use the technologies to communicate better with each other.

## Suggested Discussion Questions

- Will the new communications technologies encourage or hinder political participation at the local, state, and national levels?
- Will they reduce face-to-face interaction between individuals or will they serve as new instruments for an improved political dialogue and deliberation?
- Will the new communications technologies increase the ability of special interest groups to fragment the political process by improving their ability to appeal to narrow targeted audiences?
- Will instant polling improve communication between constituents and their representatives or undermine our system of representative democracy?
- Does government have a role in regulating the gathering and dissemination of information through these new technologies?

*Left to Right: Thomas Tauke, David Mathews, Brian Lamb and Delano Lewis at C-SPAN studio*

## Excerpts from the Luncheon Address by Representative Albert Gore, Jr.

*Albert Gore, Jr.*

If those who wrote our Constitution could have looked forward 200 years to a day when a group of distinguished Americans from around the country and different disciplines came together to talk about the perfection of citizenship, they would really think that their dreams had been realized far beyond what they had a right to ever hope for. It is precisely this kind of sustained effort and attention that is necessary if we are going to breathe life into representative democracy and make our system of government work. Your work and your discussions here are essential!

The topic which is your focus this year—shaping civic values in a technological age—is central to the problems of our time. I have felt for a long time that the main engine of change in global civilization today is the technological revolution. It is almost a cliché now to compare it to the Industrial Revolution. But it's the only available analog that illuminates it. And the amount of change involved will probably occur over a fraction of the time consumed by the Industrial Revolution. But the humanities are lagging behind the hard sciences. Developments in the hard sciences are giving mankind new powers that our ethical and legal structures have not yet equipped us to use wisely with discretion and fairly. The classic example is, of course, the development of nuclear weaponry half way through this century. Genetic engineering will be another development conferring upon us new powers that we scarcely have the wisdom to use well. The computer revolution will have the same effect.

I think that we have some cause for hope, however, that the same new technologies, particularly the communications revolution, will make possible a new kind of dialogue between the people of this country and the decision-makers in the Congress and in the executive branch. I have some apprehension about the scenario so many look forward to with a lot of excitement and optimism. The idea is that before very long Americans will sit in their living rooms and watch television and the television screen will flash a question on the screen followed by an injunction, vote yes or no, and tens of millions Amerians will lounge back in their easy chairs and decide the fate of the country by pushing a red button or a green button. Well, it sounds like a dream to some and a nightmare to others. I personally have always sided with Thomas Jefferson's view of the wisdom of the electorate and have always been inclined to place more discretion and more power wherever possible in the hands of the electorate. However, I must say that in this case we should move forward more carefully.

I had a personal experience of being on the QUBE cable television system in Columbus, Ohio, live from the steps of the Capitol. I had a bill pending on the floor, and I was able to communicate directly with the citizens of this one part of the country and they voted on the spot. Well, you may or may not be surprised to find out that 80% of them voted the way I wanted them to vote. And one reason for that may be that my opponents in the debate on the floor of the Congress did not have a chance to present their side of the argument. Obviously, the first point of caution should be that in any movement toward a system like this we have to take great care to make certain that both sides of all questions are adequately presented. And, second, I think that votes ought to be advisory and that they should serve the purpose that a public opinion poll now serves. But given those words of caution, I really believe that this new technology could involve the American people much more intimately in the decision-making process and bring the Congress of the United States much closer to the thinking of the American people.

Now, why is this so important? In the current environment, time after time, a narrow special interest prevails when an issue is being discussed. Not because they have the merits of the argument on their side. And not because they have numbers on their side. But because they have attention span on their side. Because they have intensity on their side. A standard rule of thumb to remember is that if 99% of the American people want you to vote yes, and one percent of the American people want you to vote no, then the Congress will invariably vote no if the one percent is vitally interested, and the 99% are only vaguely aware of what is going on.

What if television made it possible for many more Americans to watch not just snippits on the news, but to follow the debate? And what if out of those millions who are watching, two percent followed closely enough to become intensely involved in the outcome on the basis of the merits of the question at hand? So there is a threshold that we have to reach before the Congress begins to respond to the merits of the debate in a whole new way and the new communications technology, I believe, is going to be absolutely essential to making that possible.

Some of the new technologies are going to operate in the other direction. Cable TV is fragmenting the American audience. Computer networks, I think, also have special implications where you are going to expand in size so that a

special interest group will have even more influence and that development could push public policy outcomes in the wrong direction. Not always, but let us take just as an example the recent ten percent withholding controversy. The banking community in the United States was able to wield an enormous amount of influence in the United States Congress because of computers. In days past, it would have been physically impossible for every bank in the United States to assign someone to write, by hand, the names and addresses of the depositers who were going to be effected by this law. Now, by punching a few buttons, you can cluster millions of Americans into a single subcategory and direct correspondence to them with self-addressed post-cards that will trigger a flood of communication to the Congress. We see it all the time. And as they come in, their names are put into our computer and our computer directs correspondence to them to inform them which way the decision is going to go.

I think the combination of television and computers is going to be one of the most powerful new technologies that we have. In the face of these rapid new developments and these profound changes, the importance of an informed citizenry and the role played by the people of good will, like yourselves, who are willing to give thought to the implications of these new developments becomes even more critical, because the American people in the midst of this revolution are faced with an information explosion—an overload of information. The key to making whatever developments come in the immediate future work well is to assist the American people in cutting through the chaff to the wheat and finding critical points upon which to base intelligent decisions and then enable them to communicate with the Congress in an effective way. Thank you very much.

## Excerpts from the C-SPAN Panel Discussion

**LAMB:** Are the new communications technologies going to make it easier for us to communicate with each other? Will they be good for citizenship and citizenship education?

**MATHEWS:** I think we have to realize that technology cuts both ways and that there is a real possibility that the new technology can degrade the democratic system—that it can make collective knee jerk the law of the land. There are some real dangers to consider. So, I think for the technology to benefit us there have to be other kinds of inventions that go along with the technology. The technology won't save us. We'll have to save ourselves.

**TAUKE:** I had a teacher in high school who often suggested that the biggest problem with political leaders is that they fail to educate the people. They fail to talk with the people and explain to them the reasons for the decisions which they are making. I believe that is changing a great deal today. Later today on C-SPAN you will have an opportunity as a citizen to see the House of Representatives in action, and I can assure you that this makes a difference. People don't just sit there and passively observe the House proceedings. They react to what they're seeing. They get on the phone and ask, "why haven't you spoken out on this issue," or "I don't agree with what you just said." So I believe we are offering people the opportunity to get that education that my teacher was talking about. These new technologies are allowing people to have access, in a variety of ways, to the personalities and debates that are dominating policy-making today. These things greatly enhance the education of the citizen, allowing him or her to be a more active participant; they encourage interest in the political process, and I believe all these things strengthen the process.

**LEWIS:** I'm pleased now that technology will bring us closer together and I think it makes a difference. It certainly made a difference when I went back home during the Watergate era to hear that people understood what the process was all about. They became very much a part by listening every morning to those hearings, and every evening, and they got a sense of what government was about. So I think that understanding will be increased with technology and I certainly think it's for the benefit of this country and for citizens.

**LAMB:** Should we be concerned about technology controlling us?

**LEWIS:** How well we manage technology is going to be the key to that question. I think that many people in certain generations are fearful of this technology. That's because they have not been exposed to it. But if you'll check young children today and in many of the schools, the second graders, the third graders, they can tell you about them. They have had hands-on experience. And many of the adults really have had no experience. But once you get some sense of it, and overcome the fear, then the next job is to manage it and control it and make it work for you. And I think that can be done.

**TAUKE:** Government should attempt to ensure that all people have access to that communication system. Universality of service, if you will. We talk a lot about that now with the changes that are occurring in the telephone industry to ensure that each citizen continues to have access to that telephone network. It's also true in other aspects of the communications industry, who want to ensure that each citizen has access. It seems to me that government has to fulfill the obligations of the First Amendment to ensure that there is diversity. One of the great opportunities that is available to us with the explosion of technology is the opportunity for greater diversity. More groups have access to the airwaves than they did before. More groups have an opportunity to express a point of view. There are going to be more points of view that can be expressed. We want to ensure that there is diversity of viewpoint offered with the explosion of technology. And that limit comes to the next point and that is that there has to be something of an ethic which government cannot enforce, but which government can help establish in the country, and that ethic has to be that you use technology in a responsible way. We, in Congress, for example, can use technology to appeal incorrectly to the prejudices of a narrow group. Instead, we should develop an ethic which requires us to in a sense, speak to all people and say

the same thing to all people. Something that you can avoid doing in a sense, with the new technologies. And so there is an ethic that Congress can help develop. That doesn't mean, however, that Congress or the government should limit the content of communications. There is always great danger when we talk about diversity and so on that Congress will establish government preferred programming on television or radio, for example, and we don't want to do that. We don't want to limit the content.

**MATHEWS:** Foundations are responsible for experimenting with new things. I'll tell you what I think would be a great experiment. We know something about what cable and television can do to put us in touch with Congress, even a local government. But what can it do to put us in touch with one another at the local level? That's the question. Where are we using this marvelous technology at the community level in conjunction with a community forum or with a town hall? Where is the technology being used to put people in touch with one another so they can work out their own judgments, come to their own conclusions? Where are we using the technology to empower people at the local level? Those I think are the kinds of questions that would be worth a lot of good experimentation in this country. We haven't talked about the dangers of using that technology without it being tied to a community of reflective discourse. Without that tie, people could simply watch and react. They could press a black box and "vote" on every measure they heard discussed. That possibility scares me to death. The essence of democracy is not just participation but informed participation. We need to be talking about how technology can *inform* our participation.

**TAUKE:** Our constituents look to us . . . they say: "you have more time than we do to study the issue. You have access to more information than we do. We are electing you to not only reflect our view, but also to exercise good judgment." And it's a combination of the two. It seems to me that one of the greatest difficulties that representatives have today is keeping in touch with constituents and knowing what constituents are thinking. And so in that sense it would be very helpful to us if we had the ability to find out right away what people are thinking. How they reacted to the President's Central America speech, for example. It might take me weeks to find that out. It would be really helpful if I had a general feeling of how the people were thinking almost immediately.

**MATHEWS:** My response to the Congressman is "don't count on it." The whole history of this Republic is that people have deferred less and less. More people are going to say "look, I can get about the same information you can get now (we know as much as you know), and they're going to say "we'll vote directly." To be sure, we aren't ready to do away with representative government, but for better or worse, the trend is toward direct participation.

**TAUKE:** A lot of them do know as much as I do and some more. No doubt about that. But I think that the vast majority of the citizenry, while they want to be educated and participate, really don't believe they have the time to absorb all of the information or, perhaps, the expertise to evaluate it. And so I think they do want input on the one hand, but I'm not sure that they are, at this juncture, ready to assume final responsibility for all decision making. They want leadership as well as representation, I think.

## Program Suggestions and Resources

All of the Forum speakers emphasized the importance of looking ahead and trying to maximize the potential benefits of the new communications technologies while avoiding their potential negative consequences. But few of even the most sophisticated government watchers understand the implications of the new technologies for our political process and for public participation. A community dialogue on how to use the new technologies to improve the public debate about the future of your community should attract broad interest. Topics that could be discussed include:

- How can we best use cable television citizen access channels to inform the public and improve the dialogue between government and citizens;
- What responsibility do libraries have as information providers in the electronic age; and,
- How should we educate for citizenship at a time of rapid technological advances?

Participants should be encouraged to describe the kind of citizen participation and dialogue that they want to see in their community and then discuss how the new technologies might help them get there.

As you develop community or school panel discussion programs, it is important to include experts who understand the realistic possibilities of the technologies. A representative from the local cable television company, a technical expert from the libraries, or an engineer from the community college or private industry would be able to play this role. But it is just as important not to allow panels to be dominated by technical people. Civic leaders, humanities professors, representatives of Common Cause, citizens who have had experience using the new technologies, and others concerned with the public's capacity to identify and carry out the common good should also be included.

## Related Readings:

- *Communicating in the '80s.* This 1983 publication of The Benton Foundation of Washington, D.C. describes the new communications technologies and suggests ways in which they might be used by the nonprofit community.
- *Anticipatory Democracy* edited by Clement Bezold. This collection of essays describes a number of related efforts designed to combine future planning with broad-based public participation (Vintage Books, 1978).
- *Electronic Nightmare* by John Wicklein. The author questions whether existing laws and regulations are adequate to protect our personal freedoms in the face of the telecommunications revolution (Viking, 1981).
- *Technologies of Freedom* by Ithiel De Sola Pool. Pool examines the potential impact of the new communications technologies on free speech but argues that technological change need not result in restrictive government regulation (Belknap/Harvard, 1983).
- *The Rise of the Computer State* by David Burnham. The author discusses the potential dangers of the expanding role that computers play in our daily lives (Random House, 1983).
- *Communications Technology and Democratic Participation* by Kenneth C. Laudon. Laudon examines the potential of the new communications technologies to renew democracy and to become a new telefacism (Praeger, 1977).

# FORUM RECOMMENDATIONS

# TOWARD A NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON CIVIC VALUES IN A TECHNOLOGICAL AGE

On Monday afternoon, May 9, Forum conferees considered recommendations for future action in five group roundtable discussions. Barbara F. Finkelstein, Executive Director of the Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values, served as Roundtable Coordinator. Charles A. Tesconi, American Educational Studies Association; Katherine L. Wallin, Institute for Political and Legal Education; Donald R. Warren, Department of Educational Policy at the University of Maryland; and Lynne G. Iglitzin, National Council for the Social Studies, served as leaders of the five roundtable discussions.

On Tuesday morning, May 10, Charles H. Quigley, Executive Director of Law in a Free Society, chaired the closing general session at which reports and recommendations were received from each roundtable.

## RECOMMENDATION ONE: Toward a National Dialogue

Forum participants recognized the great challenge of shaping civic values in a technological age. For many, the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum represented their first serious exposure to the opportunities and risks that the new communications technologies present in the field of citizenship education. Determined to take hold of the technologies rather than allow the technologies to control them, conferees agreed on the importance of taking an active rather than a passive role.

*Recognizing that the potential negative impacts of the new technologies are at least as substantial as the potential benefits, participants called for a dialogue at the local level throughout the nation on the topic of shaping civic values in a technological age.* To be successful, participants stressed that this national dialogue must not be limited to the journals of national groups but must take place at the grass roots in the country at-large.

As this topic goes to the heart of our constitutional form of government, it is of special importance that the full diversity of public opinion be aired as we approach the U.S. Constitution Bicentennial in 1987.

Some of the most essential questions for national dialogue that emerged from the group discussions include:

- How does technology affect the shaping and expression of core civic values?
- In what ways could the new communications technologies facilitate or impede citizen participation in the policy process?
- What is the appropriate role for the family, schools, business, and other elements of our society in helping to shape civic values in a technological age?
- What skills will one need to be an effective citizen in the technological age?
- Is it any more difficult to master basic technological skills than to learn to read and write?
- What steps should the schools take to adjust to the realities of the new technologies?
- How might we elevate the humanities to a fundamental rather than ornamental role in the technological age?

Additional discussion questions are included throughout this conference report and discussion guide.

## RECOMMENDATION TWO: Taking Responsibility

Forum participants agreed that all elements of society have responsibility for citizenship education. Each roundtable discussion identified a number of specific tasks that would advance the national debate. Five general recommendations stood out:

- *The Council for the Advancement of Citizenship should take a leadership role in implementing the Forum's call for a national dialogue on shaping civic values in a technological age.* Through distribution of this discussion guide, coordination of the efforts of its membership organizations, and the identification of needed resources, CAC can help to inspire a genuine national dialogue at the grassroots level.
- *CAC should develop discussion packets that will enrich the efforts of local groups interested in studying and discussing the impact of technology on citizenship.* It was clear during the Forum that many participants had a keen interest in developing more current information and more sophisticated insights into these questions. This discussion guide is a first step in developing the needed materials.
- *All CAC member organizations—professional, civic, and educational—should encourage their local affiliates to educate themselves and organize dialogues on this topic.* In coordination with CAC's national effort and in collaboration with other interested local organizations, CAC member organizations should make efforts to reach beyond those who have historically taken an interest in citizenship education to solicit the diverse suggestions of a genuine cross-section of community opinion.
- *CAC member organizations should encourage their local affiliates to promote internships for students and activities for the out-of-school population that allow them to gain direct experience with the new technologies and with civic participation.* Citizens can learn best of the difficult skills of civic participation in a technological age by apply-

ing them in real life situations.

- *Business, labor, and other organizations should invest effort and money in the technological education of their employees, members, and of the public.* Citizenship education is not the sole province of the schools: all elements of society have responsibility.

## In Summary

Participants at the Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum came from diverse backgrounds and held a variety of opinions on some of the major discussion topics. But there was broad consensus on three important points:

- *The new communications technologies have the potential to change substantially our existing notions of citizenship and citizenship education in both positive and negative ways.* With the active involvement of those interested in improving citizenship education, the new technologies must be used to increase citizen understanding of their public responsibilities and improve opportunities for citizen participation. But, if careful attention is not paid to their citizenship implications, the new technologies might play havoc with our constitutional system of representative democracy.
- *It is imperative to launch a dialogue at the local level throughout the nation on the topic of shaping civic values in a technological age.* Because of the substantial potential impact of the new technologies on citizenship education, it is essential that a broad national dialogue take place as we approach the U.S. Constitution Bicentennial in 1987.
- *The ultimate success of the citizenship education effort depends not alone upon the education community but upon a creative collaboration of all elements of society, including government, business, labor, the family, the voluntary sector, the media, and others.* All elements have a stake in the impact of technology on citizenship education and all have a responsibility for advancing the public dialogue on this critical topic.

*CAC President John H. Buchanan Jr., Diane Eisenberg and Kenneth Young*

*CAC Vice President Harry Hogan*

# FORUM SPEAKERS

**R. FREEMAN BUTTS** is William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. His most recent book is *The Revival of Civic Learning* published by Phi Delta Kappa Foundation in 1980. Dr. Butts, Chairman of the Jennings Randolph Forum, is a Senior Fellow at the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and also serves in an advisory capacity to other organizations involved in the area of citizenship education.

**DIANE U. EISENBERG** serves as Executive Director of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship and Associate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. She has directed numerous nationwide education programs on issues of public concern and is presently establishing a new firm to provide program development services to educating institutions.

**BARBARA F. FINKELSTEIN** is Director of the Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values and Associate Professor of Education at the University of Maryland. She serves on the boards of many professional education organizations and is immediate past president of the American Educational Studies Association.

**CONGRESSMAN ALBERT GORE, JR.** *(D-Tenn)* has represented Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District since 1976, in his first campaign for public office. He is Chairman of the Congressional Clearinghouse for the Future and serves as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science and Technology Committee.

**STEPHEN A. JANGER** served as the first president of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship from June, 1981 through June, 1983. As President of the Close Up Foundation, which conducts one of the nation's largest citizenship education programs, he took an active interest in the establishment of the Council and worked on the original advisory committee. Prior to Close Up he worked in private business and in the Office of Protocol in the Department of State.

**HAYNES JOHNSON** is a Pulitzer-Prize winning columnist for *The Washington Post*, an author and television commentator. He has reported on most of the major news events at home and abroad for the last generation—including the activities of every president from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Ronald Reagan. In 1966, Mr. Johnson won the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished national reporting of the civil rights struggle in Selma, Alabama. He appears regularly on the PBS-TV program, "Washington Week in Review."

**BRIAN LAMB** is President and Chief Operating Officer of the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network (C-SPAN). He brings to that position extensive experience in politics and the media, having served as press secretary for Senator Peter Dominick *(R-Colo)*, assistant to the director of media and congressional affairs, Office of Telecommunications Policy and Washington bureau chief of *Cable Vision* magazine.

**DELANO E. LEWIS** is Vice President of the C&P Telephone Company. Prior to his position with C&P, Mr. Lewis served as an administrative assistant to the Honorable Walter E. Fauntroy *(D-DC)* and as a legislative assistant to Senator Edward Brooke *(R-Mass)*. Mr. Lewis currently serves on the boards of many community, civic and cultural organizations.

**DAVID MATHEWS** is President of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. He served as United States Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in the administration of President Gerald Ford and was president of the University of Alabama for 11 years. Dr. Mathews is a noted speaker and author on citizenship and public policy issues.

**BERNARD MURCHLAND** is Professor of Philosophy at Ohio Wesleyan University where he also directs the Antaeus Center for the Study of Education and Society and co-edits *The Antaeus Review*, a newsletter on liberal learning. Author of many books, articles and reviews on philosophical and social themes, Dr. Murchland serves as consultant to numerous foundations and associations.

**PAUL L. MURPHY** is a Professor of History and American Studies at the University of Minnesota. A distinguished scholar of American history and political theory, Dr. Murphy has received wide recognition for the many books and articles he has contributed to his field.

**A. CRAIG PHILLIPS** is North Carolina State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Prior to this position, Dr. Phillips served as Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent in several school districts. His commitment to education is evidenced, not only through his current position, but by his service on various education related boards and committees and through the leadership roles he has assumed in several organizations for professional educators.

**CHARLES N. QUIGLEY** is Executive Director of Law in a Free Society, a project of the Center for Civic Education. He has authored numerous citizenship education publications and has served as consultant to the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation, as well as many state and local educational institutions and associations.

**SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH** *(D-WVa.)* During his long and active career, Senator Randolph has been a journalist, college professor and airlines executive. His outstanding public service commitment has spanned 50 years as a member of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. He currently serves as a member of the Environment and Public Works, Labor and Human Resources, and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

**CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. TAUKE** *(R-Iowa)* has served in this office since his election in 1979. He has worked as a journalist, state representative and a lawyer. Currently, he is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Select Committee on Aging, and serves on several committees for the Republican party.

**RACHEL B. TOMPKINS** is Executive Director of the Children's Defense Fund. Appointed by President Carter to the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, she is also a board member of the National Child Labor Committee and the Center for Early Adolescence. She has written extensively on school finance and school desegregation.

**MICHAEL O. WARE** is Director of Legislative Affairs for Conoco, Inc.'s Washington office. A frequent speaker on national energy policy and the role of lobbying he has worked for the National Association of Manufacturers, the Federal Energy Administration and the Republican Study Committee.

**LINDA WERTHEIMER** is National Political Correspondent for National Public Radio. Assigned to report on the Senate this year, Mrs. Wertheimer has been covering the activities of the House of Representatives for National Public Radio for the past ten years.

# FORUM CONFEREES

**Bruce Adams**
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5319 Yorktown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20816

**Leslie S. Brady**
Staff Director
The Atlantic Council
1616 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

**The Honorable John H. Buchanan, Jr.**
President
Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**James R. Burton**
West Virginia Society
2111 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**Rebecca B. Butler**
Member, Board of Directors
American Association of Retired Persons
15 Eddy Lane
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002

**R. Freeman Butts**
Chair, Jennings Randolph Forum
Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**Eugene T. Carothers**
Chairman, Citizenship & Human Relations
National PTA
621 North 9th Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37206

**Henry B. Clark, II**
Professor of Social Ethics
University of Southern California
USA-Tapen Hall 337
Los Angeles, California 90089

**Marlene K. Cohn**
Voter Service Specialist
League of Women Voters
1730 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

**Allan S. Cohen**
Executive Assistant
State Superintendent of Education
Illinois State Board of Education
444 N. Capitol Street #210
Washington, D.C. 20001

**Coe F. Dexter**
Associate in Social Studies Education
New York State Department of Education
Albany, New York 11234

**Wilton Dillon**
Director
Office of Symposia and Seminars
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C.

**Diane U. Eisenberg**
Executive Director
Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**Gwen El-Sawi**
Program Manager
National 4-H Council
7100 Connecticut Avenue
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815

**Samuel B. Ethridge**
Special Assistant
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

**Joseph Fahey**
Fahey Medical Center
300 Thames Parkway
Park Ridge, Illinois 60018

**Russell F. Farnen**
Director
University of Connecticut
Asylum Avenue & Trout Brook Dr.
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

**Barbara F. Finkelstein**
Executive Director
Center for the Study of Education Policy & Human Values
3916 Garrison St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

**Jeremiah Floyd**
Associate Executive Director
National School Boards Association
1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

**Robert L. Gale**
President
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

**The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.**
U.S. House of Representatives
1131 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

**Dale Greenawald**
Director of Social Studies
West Virginia State Department of Education
Capitol Complex -377
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

**Lenneal Henderson**
Council Member
Citizens Forum on Self Government
National Municipal League
2027 Trumbull Terrace, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20011

**Mary Henze**
Assistant Director
The Jefferson Foundation
1019 9th Street, N.W., Suite 1010
Washington, D.C. 20036

**W. Robert Higgins**
Executive Director
Center for the Study of Federalism
300 Third Street, N.E. #1
Washington, D.C. 20002

**Harry J. Hogan**
Vice President
Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**Frances H. Howard**
Special Assistant to Associate Director
National Library of Medicine
8600 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20209

**Frank T. Huray**
Assistant Executive Director
Amvets National Service Foundation
4647 Forbes Road
Lanham, Maryland 20706

**Lynne B. Iglitzin**
Executive Director
National Council for the Social Studies
3501 Newark Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

**Stephen A. Janger**
Immediate Past President
Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**Haynes Johnson**
Columnist
*The Washington Post*
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071

**James R. Johnson**
Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development
225 North Washington St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

**Elizabeth H. Karnes**
Associate Producer
CBS News, New York
524 West 57th Street
New York, New York 10019

**Edward P. Keller**
Deputy Executive Director
National Association of Elementary School Principals
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 20009

**Marvin Kellerman**
Kenosha Unified School District
625 52nd Street
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53141

**Marjorie Kelly**
Director, Community Programs
Foreign Policy Association
205 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10016

**Robert J. Kingston**
Executive Director
Public Agenda Foundation
750 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10017

**Mary Ann Kirk**
President
Center for Citizenship Education
1100 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

**Brian Lamb**
President
Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network
400 N. Capitol St., N.W.
Washington, DC. 20001

**Robert Lehman**
General Counsel
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45429

**G. Timothy Leighton**
President
Convention II
300 Third Street, N.E. #1
Washington, D.C. 20002

**Delano E. Lewis**
Vice President
C&P Telephone Company
2055 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

**Dorothy MacNevin**
Associate Director
Center for the Study of Education Policy & Human Values
6227 Willmington
Burke, Virginia 22015

**Robert F. Maddox**
Chairman
Marshall University
Hal Greer Boulevard
Huntington, West Virginia 27501

**David Matthews**
President
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45429

**Laura Maxwell**
Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1246 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**Charles McBride**
Public Affairs Consultant
1702 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

**Phil McGance**
Office of The Honorable Jennings Randolph
United States Senate
3203 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

**William McInnes, S.J.**
President
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

**Paul D. Munger**
Acting Dean, ACE/ss
The American University
Massachusetts & Nebraska Avenues, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

**Bernard Murchland**
Professor of Philosophy
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43105

**Paul L. Murphy**
Professor of History
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

**Charles B. Myers**
Professor
Vanderbilt University
Box 330, Peabody College Station
Nashville, Tennessee 3703

**Alice O'Connor**
Executive Director
The Jefferson Foundation
1019 9th Street, N.W., Suite 1010
Washington, D.C. 20036

**Ron Pahl**
Social Studies Specialist
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

**Paul Patrinicola**
Social Studies Specialist
Baltimore County Public Schools
6901 Charles Street
Towson, Maryland 21204

**Michon Peck**
Member, Board of Directors
Convention II
300 Third Street, N.E., Suite 1
Washington, D.C. 20002

**A. Craig Phillips**
Superintendent
State of North Carolina
Education Building, Room 318
Trenton & Salisbury
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

**Charles N. Quigley**
Executive Director
Law in a Free Society
5115 Douglas Fir Drive, #2
Calabasas, California 91302

**The Honorable Jennings Randolph**
United States Senate
3203 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

**Mr. Paul J. F. Regnier**
Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

**Phillips Ruopp**
Vice President
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45427

**Carolyn Sachs**
Executive Director
The Benton Foundation
1776 K Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20006

**Caroline Shoemaker**
Special Assistant to the President
Boston University
147 Bay State Road
Boston, Massachusetts 22209

**James B. Shuman**
Charles F. Kettering Foundation Associate
4437 Klingle Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

**Connie Sutton**
Vice President
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
1 Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

**Charles M. Tampio**
Special Assistant to the President
Close Up Foundation
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

**The Honorable Thomas J. Tauke**
U.S. House of Representatives
435 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

**Charles A. Tesconi**
President
American Educational Studies Association
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont 05401

**Rachel Tompkins**
Executive Director
Children's Defense Fund
122 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

**Kitty Wallin**
Project Coordinator
Institute for Political & Legal Education
207 Delsea Drive, R.D. 4, Box 209
Sewell, New Jersey 08080

**Michael O. Ware**
Director of Legislative Affairs
Conoco Inc.
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

**Donald Warren**
Chairman, Department of Education Policy, Planning and Administration
University of Maryland
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20742

**Linda Wertheimer**
Correspondent
National Public Radio
2025 M St., NW
Washington, D.C.

**Angie B. Whitaker**
Executive Director
Presidential Classroom for Young Americans
441 North Lee St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

**Ellis Williams**
A.A.R.P.
15 Eddy Lane
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002

**Edward F. Wilson**
Member, National Advisory Board
Boy Scouts of America
2801 New Mexico Ave., #709
Washington, D.C. 20007

**Kenneth Young**
Executive Director
National University Continuing Education Association
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

The Council for the Advancement of Citizenship (CAC) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan national consortium of organizations and individuals committed to promoting informed and responsible citizenship.

*Members* of the Council include:*

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
American Association of Retired Persons
American Association of School Administrators
American Educational Studies Association
American Federation of Teachers
AMVETS National Service Foundation
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Boston University
Boy Scouts of America
Center for Citizenship Education
Center for Information on America
Center for the Study of Education Policy and Human Values
Center for the Study of Federalism
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
Citizens Forum on Self Government (National Municipal League)
Close Up Foundation
Convention II
Council on International & Public Affairs
Domestic Policy Association
Education Commission of the States
Foreign Policy Association
The Jefferson Foundation
Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge
Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation
The Johnson Foundation
Joint Council on Economic Education
Law in a Free Society/Center for Civic Education
Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Congress of Parents and Teachers (PTA)
National Council for the Social Studies
National Education Association
National 4-H Council
National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law
National School Boards Association
Presidential Classroom for Young Americans, Inc.
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Social Issues Resources Series, Inc.

**as of May, 1983.*

The work of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship including its Second Annual Jennings Randolph Forum has been supported in part by grants from:

**The Benton Foundation**
**Occidental International, Corp.**
**R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc.**
**and other private contributions.**

The Council is grateful for this funding assistance and appreciates, as well, the support role of the **Charles F. Kettering Foundation** and the **Close Up Foundation**.